

THE KARNATAKA LAND REVENUE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1980

Motion to consider

SRI MALLIKARJUNA M. KHARGE (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I beg to move.

‘That the Karnataka Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill, 1980 be taken into consideration.’

The question was proposed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ ಖರ್ಗೆ.—(ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು) ನಾನು ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್‌ಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೂಡ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಸದ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳು ಬಂದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ೩-೪ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಯಾವುದೇತಿಯಾಗಿ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೂ ಅಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಹಜವಾಗಿ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಉತ್ತಮಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಮ್ಯಕ್‌ನಾರ್ಥಕ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಮೂರು, ಮೂರುವರೆ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂ. ಆದಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರನ್ನು ನಾವು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆವು, ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಸಲ ಅವರು ನಾನು ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಪರ್‌ಪಸ್‌ಗೋಸ್ಕರವೆಂದು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಪುನಃ ಅವರಿಂದ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಕನ್‌ವರ್ಷನ್ ಫೀ ಎಂದು ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಮುಗಿದು ಹೋಯಿತು, ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮಗೂ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ೫೦ ಸ್ಕ್ವೇಯರ್ ಮೀಟರ್‌ಗಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಕೇವಲ ೨ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಉಳಿದವರಿಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್‌ವ್ಯಾಲ್ಯು ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಗತಿಪರವಾದ ಕಾನೂನು ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ೧೪ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—Sir, through this piece of legislation Government wants to bring the entire land under the control of the Revenue Department. They are not willing to exempt the cities and you are aware that cities are already paying several taxes. Now once again the Government wants to collect the land revenue from the people. I do not know who thought about this sort of legislation

SRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE.—It is not only in Bangalore. It is there in almost all the States.

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—It may be in other States. But I urge upon the Government to withdraw this Bill. Sir, in this Bill at page 5 a table is given. According to that, local area with a population exceeding 15,000 but not exceeding 50,000 the land revenue to be paid by the people is as follows.

For industrial purposes	...	15 paise,
For Commercial purposes	...	15 paise,
For non-agricultural purposes including residential purposes	...	6 paise

Like that they have mentioned a scale of land revenue to be paid by the people, and at the end it is stated that the amount of compounded non-agricultural land revenue payable shall not exceed Rs. 2 per year. That means, the Government wants to collect Rs. 2 from the people. It is a sort of compulsion on the people to pay the land revenue. We are all aware about the living conditions of the poor people residing in villages. In that situation how do you expect them to pay land revenue? Do you think this is a progressive measure to help the poor?

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—We are collecting this land revenue in order to confer legal rights.

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—For that, you need not collect land revenue from poor people. You can confer the rights without collecting the amount. The municipalities, the Corporations, and the Boards could confer the rights. The Government need not collect any fee from poor people. If you do so, then we can call it as a progressive measure. But, here by brining this piece of legislation you are making it compulsory to pay Rs. 2 towards land revenue.

SRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE.—We are collecting the revenue as a taken from the poor people whereas we are imposing higher rate of land revenue on industrialists and on other persons who are using non-agricultural land. Hence by that we are going to get nearly Rs. 3 crores. Is it not a progressive measure?

SRI C M ARMUGHAM.—But there must be a limit. You want to collect the tax in some form or the other and under the guise of collection you have brought in a law and imposed it on the poor people. How do you call it as a progressive Act? Supposing a person runs an industry or commerce or business he has to pay so many taxes to various agencies. In addition to that he has to pay the land revenue hereafter. I am only asking questioning the wisdom of the Government in bringing this Bill and under the guise of collecting the land revenue you are creating hardship for the poor and middle class people. Now I would like to know from the Hon'ble Minister whether any statistics has been worked out in respect of revenue you are going to get by bringing this Bill and how many people will be

affected by this legislation and how many people owning lands above 50 sq. mtr are there how many of them are going to get exemption from payment of tax etc. Have you worked out?

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—Why should they be exempted?

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—There are some people who are not in a position to pay land revenue and you must exempt such categories of people from payment of this land revenue. But here you have made it compulsory. So, it is not a good measure. By bringing this Bill there will be lot of litigation because at Page 4 it is state that—

“the persons owning land for non-agricultural purposes have to file returns.”

How do you expect villagers to file proper returns? If the villagers want to file a return they have to spend some money for the people or to someone in the Dy. Commissioner's office.

SRI MALLIKARJUNA KHARGE.—We have got special machinery at the Deputy Commissioner's level. We help them.

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—It is not there. The Deputy Commissioner has no machinery to help the poor villagers to file returns. The people have to make their own arrangements to file the returns. They have to spend nearly ten to fifteen rupees. Where should they go to get this money when they are in poverty? I think most of the members have gone through the articles published in today's Deccan Herald about the living conditions of the people who live in slums. The people living in slums do not get drinking water. They are using drain water for drinking purposes, they have no clothes to wear. The Hon'ble Revenue Minister might have seen the living conditions of the people living in Gulbarga. It is same in Anekal, Mysore, Chickmagalur and everywhere. That being the position of the poor people, you ask them to pay land revenue and you are calling this as a progressive measure. Don't you realise the difficulties of the poor people? In the guise of collecting land revenue from the rich people you are sucking the blood the poor people.

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—For poor people we have given free site ನಿವೃ ಯಾವ ಕ್ಯಾಟರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ ಅವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಉಚಿತ ನಿವೇಶನಗಳು ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸ್ಕೆಟುಗಳು ೩—೪ ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಿಡಿವಿ, ಸ್ಕೆಟುಗಳು ೩೦—೪೦ ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರವಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ದಿನೇ ದಿನೇ ಸ್ಕೆಟುಗಳ ಬೆಲೆ ಏರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ತಾವು ಆಲೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. Should we not recognise their rights? Let there be a scientific argument and definitely we concede to that.

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—Do you say that my argument is not scientific and not based on facts? I welcome giving free sites. But under this Bill you are collecting Rs. 2 from poor people. When you are giving free sites worth of Rs. 3,000 and 4,000 why do you want to collect Rs. 2/- from them?

5-30 P. M.

If the intention of the Government is to collect money from a rich class of people living in palatial buildings, the Government need not worry about it. The Corporation can look after that. They are already collecting the house tax according to the rental value. The Corporation can look after that. They are already collecting the house tax according to the rental value. The Corporation is under the control of the Government. If it is necessary and if the Corporation wants some more money, the Government can direct them to increase the House Tax. I do not understand as to why the Government is bothered about it. I am sure, this Bill will definitely affect the poor and middle class people.

SRI Y. RAMAKRISHNA.—We have to confirm legal rights. In order to confirm legal rights, he must be in a position to possess something. Therefore, we have put this land revenue of Rs. 2/- per year. It is an additional safety to protect their titles.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—There is no need for additional safety. That is what I am arguing. This tax was not there hitherto. Sir. I had an occasion to visit Bhalki. I saw those burnt houses and the pitiable condition of those people. There was nothing for them to eat except to cry. When they cry, there was no water in their eyes. That is the position under which they are living. Therefore, Bhalki comes within the purview of Municipal area. Will it be fair on the part of the Government to collect Rs. 2/- from them? The Municipality gives the right to property. There is a Planning Authority to confirm their legal rights. This tax will be additional burden on them. They are already paying taxes to the Municipalities and Corporation for Education, Health, Library, Sanitation etc. etc. The Government have exempted Land Revenue to the extent of Rs. 10 crores irrespective of rich or poor in the rural areas. Then why do they want to collect Rs. 2/- per year from those who are owning 10'x10' or 5x5' sites? Therefore, I only appeal to the Government and the Hon. Minister for Revenue to kindly withdraw this Bill. There is no necessity for this Bill. Let us not have multi-tax. It is not advisable and fair on the part of the Government and particularly, on the part of the Hon. Minister for Revenue, who is far the poor and the middle class people. My only appeal is to withdraw this Bill.

SRI B. SUBBAIAH SHETTY (Surtakal).—Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, this Bill which is introduced hereby the Hon. Minister for Revenue introduces altogether a new type of tax. At present, the Karnataka Urban Land Tax Act, 1976 provides for levy of urban land tax at graded rates based on the market value of the urban lands and applicable only to eleven cities in the State. Now that type of taxation is being replaced by another new type of taxation under this Act which has been made applicable to those 11 cities from 1976 itself. Sub-clause (3) of Clause-1 reads thus.

“(3) Section 5 shall come into force at once and other sections shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April 1976 in the Bangalore Urban Agglomeration, the Corporations of Belgaum, Hubli-Dharwad and Mysore and in the City Municipalities of Bellary, Bijapur, Davangere, Gulbarga, Mangalore and Shimoga, and the Town Municipality of Bhadravathi and on the first day of July, 1979 in other areas of the State of Karnataka”.

I would like to know from the Hon. Minister for Revenue, whether the taxes due from those 11 cities were realised or are they in arrears? Whether the taxes due from those 11 cities will be considered by the Government or will they be adjusted according to the calculations under this Bill? What are those arrears? As far as my knowledge goes, the arrears are huge and now an attempt is being made by the Government under this Act to distribute it all over the State, thereby reducing the burden of those 11 cities. Even they are going to collect it from smaller cities like Ankal, Bhalki etc., whose population is more than 15,000/-. By virtue of this Bill the Government is going to spread out that huge arrears of land revenue due from the residents of those 11 cities, on those small cities all over the State. I would like the Hon. Minister for Revenue to clarify whether it is a fact or not. Apart from it, in a local area with a population exceeding 15,000 but not exceeding 50,000, the Government is going to charge six paise towards the land revenue per year per square meter on land used for any other non-agricultural purpose including residential purpose; for commercial purpose 15 paise and for Industrial purpose 15 paise. It is entirely a new tax which has not been known to the people other than those 11 cities. Who will get the real benefit under this Bill? Sir, by spreading this land revenue all over the smaller towns in the State, the citizens of those 11 cities will only get the real benefit. This is the major aspect of this Bill. Another thing which I would like to mention is regarding an amendment to Section 95 which is a very important

thing to some of the districts. Lastly, my only suggestion through you Sir to the Government is, it will be in the fitness of things, to refer this Bill in conjunction with the Bill which is to be taken up tomorrow pertaining to an amendment to Section 95, to a Joint Select Committee for its report. After all, the Government is not going to lose anything since the Urban Land Tax is already there. I feel that the Government reconsider it in detail and not to pass it in a hurry.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೆಂಕಟಾಚಾರ್ಯನ್ ಬಾರ್ಗ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಕೃಷಿಯೇತರ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಭೂ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ವಸೂಲ್ಯಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಹೊಸದೇನಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅರ್ಮಿಗಂ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ೧೯೭೬ರೊಂದಿಗೂ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ನಗರ ಮತ್ತು ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಗರ ಭೂ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿತ್ತು. ಸುಮಾರು ೧,೦೦,೩೪೪ assesses declaration file ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ೧೪೮೫ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ೧೯೭೬ ರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ವಸೂಲ್ಯಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ೩೧ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ರಿಟ್ ಹೋದ ಮೇಲೆ, ನಂತರ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ ಇದನ್ನು ತಡೆಹಿಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಕೇವಲ ೧೧ ನಗರಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸೀಮಿತವಾಗಿರಬಾರದು. ದಿನೇ ದಿನೇ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿಸ್ತರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಕಾನೂನಿನಂತೆ ಕೆಲವರು ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕೆಲವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಮನಸ್ಸಿದ್ದ ಕೆಲವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರು; ಕೆಲವರು ಕೊಡಬಾರದು, ನೋಡೋಣ ಎಂದು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಲು ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಡೆಲಿಗೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ. The Deputy Commissioner is empowered to determine the grant value under Section 5 which shall remain in force for a period of five years. ಅದುದರಿಂದ, ತಾವು ಯಾರೂ ಭಯಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕರಿಸಿ ಅವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಡೆಲಿಗೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗೇನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ರಸ್ತೆ, ಬಳೆಚರಂಡಿ, ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರು ಮುಂತಾದ ಸವಲತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳಿವೆ ?

“Provided that in respect of land not exceeding fifty square metres in area and used solely for residential purpose the amount of compounded non-agricultural land revenue payable shall not exceed two rupees per year” ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ

ದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾಳೆ ಅವರ ಬಳಿ ದಾಖಲೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್‌ಗಾಗಲೀ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಾಗಲಾಗಲೀ title claim ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ದಾಖಲೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಎರಡು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಯಿತು ಎಂದರೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ, ಇದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಈಡೇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಯೋಚಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಳಕಳಿಯಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is—

“That the Karnataka Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill, 1980 be taken into consideration.”

The Motion was adopted

CLAUSES 2 TO 4

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. As there are no amendments, I will put clauses 2 to 4, both inclusive, to the vote of the House. The question is.

“That clauses 2 to 4, both inclusive do stand part of the Bill.”

The Motion was adopted

Clauses 2 to 4, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE-5

MR. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment.

SRI MALLIKARJUNA M. KHARGE.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That in clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 126-G sought to be inserted by this clause for the words “the Karnataka University”, the words “the Gulbarga University, the Karnataka University, the Mangalore University” shall be substituted.”

The question was proposed

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is.

“That in clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 126-G sought to be inserted by this clause for the words “the Karnataka University”, the words “the Gulbarga University, the Karnataka University, the Mangalore University” shall be substituted.

The Motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is.

“That Clause 5, as amended, do stand part of the Bill.

The Motion was adopted

CLAUSE 5 as amended, was added to the Bill.

CLAUSES 6

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“ That clause 6 do stand part of the Bill ”

The motion was adopted

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.”

CLAUSE 1 etc

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is.

“ That Clause 1, the Long Title the Preamble and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill. ”

The motion was adopted

“ Clause 1, the Long Title, the Preamble and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

MOTION TO PASS

SRI MALLIKARJUN M. KHARGE.—Sir, I move.

“ That the Karnataka Land Revenue (Amendment) Bill, 1981, as amended, be passed ”.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is.

“ That the Karnataka Land Revenue Amendment) Bill, 1981, as amended, be passed .”

The Motion was adopted and the Bill as amended was passed

SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we will adjourn the House today and take up the remaining Bills on some other day.

SRI A. B. JAKANUR.—Sir, the Karnataka Toddy Workers' Welfare Fund Bill, 1981 may be taken in the next week and I have no objection. But there is a small Repeal Bill and it will take only two minutes.

THE MYSORE FACTORIES (CONTROL OF DISMANTLING) (REPEAL) BILL, 1981

Motion to consider

SRI A. B. JAKANUR (Minister for Labour).—Sir, I beg to move:

“ That the Mysore Factories (Control of Dismantling, (Repeal) Bill, 1981 be taken into consideration.”

The question was proposed